

REMARKS

Claims 7-14 are presented for consideration, with Claims 7 and 11 being independent.

The specification has been reviewed and amended to correct minor informalities and improve its idiomatic English form. In addition, the abstract has been replaced to better set forth technical features of the claimed invention.

In the claims, independent Claims 7 and 11 have been amended to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art. In addition, Claims 12-14 have been added to provide an additional scope of protection. Support for the claim amendments and the new claims can be found, for example, in Figures 5-8 and the corresponding specification on page 18, line 20, *et seq.* Claims 1-6 have been cancelled.

The cancellation of Claims 5 and 6, as indicated above, renders moot the objection set forth in paragraph 1 (page 2) of the Office Action.

Applicants are submitting concurrently herewith a Submission of Replacement Sheets of Drawings, labeling Figures 9, 10(a) and 10(b) as "Prior Art."

Claims 1, 4, 7 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. It is submitted that the amendments shown above overcome this rejection, and therefore reconsideration and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Keely '694 in view of Ely '339. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Keely and Ely in further view of Christensen '259. Finally, Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Keely and Ely in further view of Mitsui '444. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 of Applicants' invention relates to a display apparatus comprised of a substrate having a metal layer, and a display device disposed on the substrate, with the display device including a display portion and a driving portion. In addition, a sensor portion detects a

coordinate using electromagnetic induction and is arranged on an opposite side of the substrate from the where the display device is disposed. As also claimed, the metal layer of the substrate has an electromagnetic wave transmissive structure.

Claim 11 relates to an input apparatus that includes a substrate, a display device, and a sensor portion as set forth in Claim 7. In addition, a pen designates a position on a display surface and generates an electromagnetic wave locally at the designated position.

In accordance with Applicants' invention, a high performance display can be provided.

The primary citation to Keely relates to a pen digitizer that includes, with reference to Figure 1, a display layer 10, a liquid crystal display layer 12, a backlight layer 16, and a digitized layer 18. The display layer includes a front glass 34, a back glass 36, and a back polarizer 40. The digitized layer includes a digitizer grid 60 bonded to a digitizer substrate 64. A metal shield 66 is bonded to the back of the substrate 64.

The secondary citation to Ely relates to a positioning sensor and is cited for its disclosure of coils disposed in parallel with each other on a digitizer substrate.

Without conceding to the propriety of combining Keely and Ely in the manner proposed in the Office Action, it is submitted that such a combination still fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. For example, independent Claims 7 and 11 provide a substrate comprising a metal layer, and a sensor portion arranged on an opposite side of the substrate from where a display device is disposed. These features, among others, are not taught or suggested in the proposed combination of art. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is in order and such action is respectfully requested.

The tertiary citation to Christensen relates to a display device and relied on for its teaching of a metal layer having a woven polymer fiber. The tertiary citation to Mitsui relates to an LCD device and is cited for its teaching of an uneven substrate layer. These tertiary citations

fail, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Keely and Ely as discussed above with respect to the independent claims. Therefore, without conceding to the propriety of combining the art in the manner proposed in the Office Action, such combinations still fail to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 7 and 11 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 8-10 and 12-14 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

---

Scott D. Malpede  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/rnm